Applicant: Patrice Roussel Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-644001 / P12488

Serial No.: 10/032,144

Filed: December 20, 2001

Page : 12 of 14

REMARKS

Claims 1-58 and 73-82 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 19, 24, 27, 33, 38, 43, 49, 54, 73 and 77 are independent claims.

The examiner continues to use Sidwell to reject claims 1, 5, 9, 19 and 73 as having been anticipated. The examiner continues to argue that this anticipation is clear.

Applicant respectfully asks that the examiner reconsider Sidwell in light of applicant's claims and the discussion presented below.

Claims 1, 5, 9, 19 and 73 recite "load a first portion of bits of a source into a first portion of a destination register and duplicate that first portion of bits in a subsequent portion of the destination register," or similar language. This quoted claim feature is clearly neither described nor suggested in Sidwell.

Sidwell discloses an instruction that retains first and last substrings of a data string in unchanged positions and interchanges the position of at least two intermediate substrings. (page 1, paragraph 57, and the Byte Replicate on page 5, lines 46-59) Thus, Sidwell clearly and distinctly moves an exact copy of a first portion of bits from a source to a first portion of bits in a destination. Sidwell clearly and distinctly moves an exact copy of a last portion of bits from the source to a last portion of bits in the destination. Sidwell clearly and distinctly moves and interchanges at least two intermediate strings of bits from the source to the destination. For example, if Sidwell's source contained 0011 01 1010, then after Sidwell's move/interchange instruction, the destination would contain 0011 10 1010, where 0011 is a first portion and not modified in the move from the source to the destination, 1010 is a last portion and not modified

Applicant: Patrice Roussel Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-644001 / P12488

Serial No.: 10/032,144

Filed: December 20, 2001

Page : 13 of 14

in the move from the source to the destination, and 01 is an intermediate portion in the source and is interchanged to 10 in the destination after the move.

How can this anticipate applicant's quoted claim feature? Applicant's claimed invention loads a first portion of bits of a source into a first portion of a destination register and duplicates that first portion of bits in the destination in a subsequent portion of the destination register.

Using the example above, given 0011 as a first portion of the source and the source register containing 0011 10 1010, then the destination register would contain 0011 10 0011. Here, the first portion, 0011, is moved to the destination, and that first portion 0011 is duplicated in a subsequent portion of the destination. Applicant's claimed invention moves and duplicates while Sidwell moves and interchanges. Accordingly, claims 1, 5, 9, 19 and 73 cannot be anticipated by Sidwell.

The examiner uses Sidwell to reject dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-18, 20-58 and 74-82 and having been obvious.

As discussed above, Sidwell does not teach or suggest "load a first portion of bits of a source into a first portion of a destination register and duplicate that first portion of bits in a subsequent portion of the destination register." One skilled in this art would not be lead to or by Sidwell to provide this feature because Sidwell teaches a move and interchange instruction while applicant's claimed invention is a move and duplicate instruction. No interchanging of intermediate portions occurs in applicant's claim invention. Thus, independent claims 1, 5, 9, 19 and 73 are not rendered obvious by Sidwell.

Applicant: Patrice Roussel Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-644001 / P12488

Serial No.: 10/032,144

Filed

: December 20, 2001

Page

: 14 of 14

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-18, 20-58 and 74-82 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claims 1, 5, 9, 19 and 73. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-18, 20-58 and 74-82 are rendered obvious by Sidwell.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.

225 Franklin Street

Boston, MA 02110-2804 Telephone: (617) 542-5070

Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21015127.doc